I.   35 U.S.C. §102

       A.   The Rejection over Elzur

       Claims 1, 3-4, 21, 23, 28-31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as
allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,427,169 to Elzur.

       1.   Claim 1

       Regarding claim 1, the latest Office Action states, on pages 2 and 3:

              As per claim 1, Elzur discloses an interface device for a computer,
       the interface device connectable to a network and a storage unit, the
       storage unit including a disk drive, the interface device comprising:
       • A sequencer including a hardware logic circuit configured to
         process a transport layer header of a network packet (column 2,
         lines 43-47, 55-58, 64-67, column 3, lines 1-4);
       • A memory adapted to store control information regarding a
         network connection being handled by said device (column 4, lines
         2-4, 15-17, 62-67);
       • A mechanism for associating said packet with said control
         information (column 4, lines 20-30, column 5, lines 5-10).
       • selecting whether to process said packet by said computer or to
         send data from said packet to the storage unit, thereby avoiding the
         computer (column 5, lines 59-65, column 6, lines 7-10, 42-52);
       • the storage unit including a disk drive (column 11, lines 57-64).

       Although applicants disagree with this rejection, as previously discussed, in an
effort to expedite prosecution applicants have amended claim 1 to remove the recitation
of "the interface device connectable to a network and a storage unit, the storage unit
including a disk drive" from the preamble, because the preamble is not being affording
patentable weight.

       Applicants have also amended claim 1 to recite, in part, "a first network port" and
"a second network port." Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on
page 16, lines 3-6 of the application. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to recite, in
part, "control information defining a transport layer connection established by the
computer and handled by said device." Support for this amendment can be found, for
example, on page 24, line 30 – page 25, line 2 of the application. Applicants have also
amended claim 1 to recite, in part, "sending data from said packet via a second network
port to the storage unit, thereby avoiding the computer." Support for this amendment can

be found, for example, on page 14, lines 16-20 of the application. Applicants respectfully assert that neither Elzur nor any other reference cited teaches or suggests amended claim 1.

Independent claims 21 and 28 have been amended in a manner similar to that of claim 1, and applicants respectfully assert that those independent claims are patentable for similar reasons. Dependent claims 3, 23, 29 and 30 have been amended to comport with the amendments to the respective independent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

   /Mark Lauer/
Mark Lauer
Reg. No. 36,578
Silicon Edge Law Group LLP
6601 Koll Center Parkway
Suite 245
Pleasanton, CA 94566
Tel: (925) 621-2121
Fax: (925) 621-2125